

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

NETLIST, INC.,	§	
	§	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	§	
	§	
v.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:22-CV-00293-JRG
	§	(Lead Case)
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO, LTD, <i>et</i>	§	
<i>al.</i>	§	
	§	
<i>Defendants.</i>	§	

NETLIST, INC.,	§	
	§	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	§	
	§	
v.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:22-CV-00294-JRG
	§	
MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC., <i>et al.</i>	§	
	§	
<i>Defendants.</i>	§	

ORDER

Before the Court is Netlist’s Opposed Motion to Expedite Briefing on Netlist’s Motion for Relief from Protective Order (the “Motion to Expedite”). (Dkt. No. 559.) On February 14, 2024 Netlist filed its Motion for Relief from the Protective Order (Dkt. No. 553) seeking to present certain portions of testimony of Samsung’s corporate representative in this case to Judge Scarsi in the parties co-pending litigation in the Central District of California. (*Id.*) The next day, Netlist filed the present Motion to Expedite requesting that Samsung’s response be due Tuesday, February 20, 2024. (*Id.*)


Samsung opposes the Motion to Expedite arguing that the urgency of Netlist’s motion is due to Netlist’s own delay in filing the motion and that Netlist failed to comply with the meet and

confer requirement under the local rules. (Dkt. No. 604.) Samsung instead offers to respond in eleven (11) days (i.e., by Monday, February 26, 2024) rather than the normal fourteen (14) days.

Having considered the Motion to Expedite and the subsequent briefing, the Court finds that the same should be and hereby is **GRANTED-IN-PART** and **DENIED-IN-PART**. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Samsung's response to Netlist's Motion for Relief from the Protective Order (Dkt. No. 553), if any, shall be due **Wednesday, February 21, 2024, by 4:00 p.m. CST**.

So Ordered this

Feb 19, 2024



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE